

Date: 07/07/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/014836/Y

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/014836/Y

I write in connection with your request for information dated 27/05/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

*I would be grateful if you could provide the following information specific to the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Rochdale, [REDACTED]*

- 1. Crime Statistics for the area – including but not limited to:**
 - *Drug-related activity*
 - *Incidents of violence or anti-social behaviour*
 - *Burglary, robbery, or theft*
- 2. Information relating to risks to children, particularly:**
 - *Known or suspected drug dealing locations*
 - *Incidents or concerns related to child sexual exploitation (CSE)*
 - *Known sexual offenders in the vicinity*
 - *Any recorded incidents or concerns related to abduction or grooming*
- 3. Any risk assessments or community safety summaries produced or held by your department relevant to the area.**
- 4. Contact details for a safeguarding or community liaison officer, or any relevant point of contact within your department who could assist with further information or risk mitigation advice.**

We are looking for data from the last 3 years.

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate the requested information and I can confirm the information requested is held by GMP.

However, I am not obliged to supply all the data for question 2 as exemptions apply.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires GMP, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) to provide you, the applicant, with a notice which: (a) states that fact, (b) specifies the exemption in question and (c) states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies.

The exemption which applies to question 1 of this request is:

Section 31(1)(a)(b) – Law Enforcement
Section 40(5B)(a)(i) - Personal Information

Greater Manchester Police can neither confirm nor deny that it holds the information you requested for Q2 - • *Known sexual offenders in the vicinity*, as the duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply, by virtue of the following exemption:

Section 40(5B)(a)(i) - Personal Information – giving information to a member of the public of the confirmation or denial that would have to be given to comply with section 1(1)(a) would (apart from this Act) contravene any of the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018.

To confirm that any information is held or not, could confirm personal data. In some circumstances confirming or denying whether information is held could itself identify a living individual and would therefore breach the principles of the GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

Personal data is defined by Article 4 of the GDPR and Part 1 of the Data Protection Act 2018 and means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person ('data subject'). An identified natural person is one who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data.

This use of neither confirm nor deny should not be taken as proof that such information does or does not exist.

Section 31 is prejudice based and qualified exemptions; there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in disclosing such information as well as carrying out a public interest test, which can be seen below.

HARM

Disclosure of the details of known or suspected drug dealing locations would reveal tactical capability and vulnerabilities and would compromise the efficient and effective conduct of Greater Manchester Police during these operations. Revealing any information regarding this could jeopardize any ongoing operations that may be taking place and any premature disclosure could compromise investigative methods or lead to the destruction of evidence.

The safety of the public is of a paramount importance to Greater Manchester Police and to release the details of operations would compromise the safety of the public that Greater Manchester Police serve to protect.

Furthermore, this would impact the future law enforcement capabilities of Greater Manchester Police in the prevention and detection of crime as criminals intent on committing crime will have an insight on how and when police resources are used.

Factors Favouring Disclosure

Disclosure would promote openness in GMP's ability to identify and monitor drug activity in area's across the borough. Disclosure would also highlight how public funds are spent in policing this area of crime.

Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure

Any disclosure of these location could comprise any ongoing investigations and revealing information could endanger any undercover officers that may be in the field. It could also hinder the cooperation of witnesses to come forward for the fear of retaliation and could even place the public/resident in this area at risk.

Revealing such locations or acknowledging that GMP are aware of these could lead to wanted criminals or organisations being “tipped off” which could lead to the destruction of evidence, suspects may leave the area to avoid detection and could breakdown the surveillance of operations.

Additionally, any criminals wanting to avoid detection would know which area's are under GMP's watch and will avoid these locations, thus making the apprehension and detection a crime reduced.

Balance Test

When balancing the public interest Greater Manchester Police has to consider whether the information should be released into the public domain. Arguments need to be weighed against each other. The most persuasive reason for disclosing the information would be Greater Manchester Police's accountability. This needs to be weighed against the strongest reason for non-disclosure which is the police service is charged with enforcing the law; preventing and detecting crime and protecting the people/communities we serve.

In this case this is the fact that individuals may be placed at risk and the affect it may have on the prevention and detection of crime. In this case, I believe the case for disclosure is not made out.

The police will not divulge any information that would place the safety of an individual at risk or undermine law enforcement. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing, and in this case providing assurance that the police service is appropriately and effectively engaging with the threat posed by criminal activity, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding the resource capability which could highlight which events the force is focussing more.

In accordance with the Act, this letter represents a Refusal Notice for this part of the request.

Please see the remaining information below.

Caveats.

In July 2019, GMP implemented one of the largest IT infrastructure changes in UK policing. The systems are in continual development and the data provided for this request is what the systems currently hold.

This data contains crimes with a created date between 01/07/2022 and 25/06/2025 where the beat name is 'Cutgate', excluding cancelled crimes and crimes classified as fraud. Further information about cancelled crimes can be obtained from the Home Office Counting Rules. Details regarding fraud crime can be obtained by contacting the NFIB.

We are aware of a system issue affecting **migrated crimes with some crime flags**. This issue caused flags to be lost i.e. change from Yes to blank incorrectly during the migration process. The following flags are affected:

- Child sexual exploitation flag

This data contains incidents with a created date between 01/07/2022 and 25/06/2025 where the beat name is 'Cutgate', and the closure code is one of the following ('D08','D12','D13','D17','D50','D52','D70','D71','D80','D90','D91','D92','D93','D95') to identify antisocial

behaviour incidents, excluding incidents with a closing code of L10 Duplicate, L19 Error or L22 Test or training.

Due to some low results, some data for Q1 has been replaced with X as by providing all this information as you have requested would significantly increase the likelihood of identifying the individual(s) concerned, and as such the exemption under S40(2) – Personal Information, would be engaged and result in information being refused. By replacing the data this way, it can be provided in its entirety.

1. See table below.
2. See exemption above.
3. No information held.
4. Please use the following link to make contact with your local area. [Spotland and Falinge | Rochdale | Greater Manchester Police | Greater Manchester Police](#)

All other theft offences	17
Business and community burglary	X
Criminal damage and arson offences	23
Miscellaneous crimes against society	6
Other sexual offences	7
Possession of drugs	X
Possession of weapon offences	X
Public order offences	36
Rape	X
Residential burglary	13
Robbery of personal property	X
Shoplifting	13
Stalking and harassment	72
Trafficking of drugs	X
Vehicle offences	19
Violence with injury	46
Violence without injury	68